

Applicant: Veli Käsmä et al.  
Application No.: 10/507,451  
Response to Office action mailed Apr. 20, 2005  
Response filed June 21, 2005

#### Remarks

Claims 8–18 remain pending in the application. Claims 17 and 18 have been added. In the Office action dated Apr. 20, 2005, the title of the invention was objected to as not being sufficiently specific. Claim 8 was objected to because of informality, on the grounds that “coated” should be inserted before “web” for clarity. Claims 10, 11 were rejected as indefinite because “hard” was deemed not to convey or distinctly claim the intended hardness of the rolls.

The title of the invention has been amended as required by the examiner. Claim 8 has been amended to insert “coated” before “web”. Claims 10 and 11 have been amended to add “metal” after hard, thereby clarifying what is meant by hard as distinct from resilient rolls, see paragraphs [0031] and [0025] which support this limitation. Thus “hard” is seen as distinguishing over the term of art “resilient” or “soft”.

Claims 1–12, 15, and 16 were rejected as obvious over Tholome FR in viewing of Williams Jr. et al. Claims 13–14 were rejected over Tholome FR in view of Williams Jr. et al. alone or further in view of Liberto.

Claim 14 has been rewritten in independent form containing all the limitations of claim 8 and claim 13 from which it formerly depended, and further amended to specify how the wire-shaped electrode is positioned with respect to the web. The art of record does not suggest or give any expectation that electrodes so shaped and positioned would be advantageous in coating both sides of a paper web as set forth in amended claim 14.

Claim 8 has been amended to clarify that the coating is a dry power i.e., not a liquid as used in Tholome FR. The uses of a liquid in Tholome FR to coat both sides of a web is clear because no means of fixing the coating to the web is shown, for a liquid no such means is required but a dry power requires fixing as by the claimed “nip formed between two heated members”. Further, claim 8 has been limited to a coating powder having 10.1 wt.-% inorganic material and including a polymeric binder material. New claims 17–18 are further limited to a coating power having 80–95 wt.-% inorganic.

Combining Tholome FR with Williams Jr. et al. requires that a suggestion for

Applicant: Veli Käsmä et al.  
Application No.: 10/507,451  
Response to Office action mailed Apr. 20, 2005  
Response filed June 21, 2005

combination and an expectation of success be found in the prior art. The art of record does not lead to a suggestion to perform the claimed method of essentially simultaneously coating both sides of a web with a dry power which is in part inorganic and in part polymeric binder material, nor does the art of record lead to an expectation of success for such claimed coating method.

Applicant believes that no new matter has been added by this amendment.

Applicant submits that the claims, as amended, are in condition for allowance.

Favorable action thereon is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Patrick J.G. Stiennon, Reg. No. 34934  
Attorney for Applicant  
Stiennon & Stiennon  
P.O. Box 1667  
Madison, Wisconsin 53701-1667  
(608) 250-4870  
Amdt2.res/amdt